

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/649,192	ISLAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Juba, Jr.	2872	

All Participants:

(1) John Juba, Jr.

(2) Mr. Brian Gaffney
Status of Application: Allowed Herewith

(3) Dr. Mohammed Islam

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6 August 2004
Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

43 and 57

Prior art documents discussed:

Knipe (Appl. Pub. no. US 2002/0093721 A1); Anderson, et al (US 6,208,318); Broddin, et al (US 6,011,631); Nelson, et al (US 6,163,363)
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. ~~The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.~~ *A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II.*
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted Applicant's representative to raise a concern about possible prior art displays or printing arrangements that may employ mirror arrays wherein the elements partially rotate in response to an analog drive signal, and wherein a color splitting prism may be regarded as a "signal separator" providing an unmodulated signal to one of a plurality of mirror arrays. The examiner indicated that Knipe may at least suggest such an arrangement. Subsequently, Applicant and his representative contacted the examiner to discuss possible claim language that would distinguish over such an arrangement, even assuming such an arrangement were disclosed or suggested in the prior art. Specific changes to the language of claims 43 and 57 was agreed upon as clearly distinguishing over the prior art. Applicant authorized the examiner to enter the changes by examiner's amendment. The examiner indicated that the Anderson, et al reference listed above, will be cited with the accompanying Office action, along with any additional references of interest that surface. Applicant disclosed that, after the time the examiner raised the issue of displays and color printers, Applicant had become aware of the Broddin and Nelson references listed above. The examiner indicated that he had "tagged" these references as part of his own search, and will consider these references and make them of record (on a PTO-892) with the Notice of Allowability, or with the next Office action, if the references raise a new question of patentability. The examiner indicated that Applicant NEED NOT list these references on a form PTO-1449, PTO/SB/08, or equivalent, or cite them in a formal I.D.S. .